

# **EXHIBIT 9**

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

SONOS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:20-cv-00881-ADA

**GOOGLE LLC’S FIRST OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO  
PLAINTIFF SONOS, INC.’S FIRST SET OF FACT DISCOVERY INTERROGATORIES**

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Standing Order Regarding Venue and Jurisdictional Discovery Limits For Patent Cases, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) hereby objects and responds to Plaintiff Sonos, Inc.’s (“Sonos”) First Set of Fact Discovery Interrogatories to Defendant (“Interrogatories”). Google responds to these Interrogatories based on its current understanding and the information reasonably available to Google at the present time. Google reserves the right to supplement these responses if and when additional information becomes available.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES**

1. These responses are made only for the purposes of discovery in this action. Each response is subject to all appropriate objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, and any and all other objections and grounds that would require the exclusion of any information, documents, or statements contained in the responses if such information, documents, or statements were offered in court. Google expressly reserves all such objections and may interpose them at the time of trial or at any other time.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

2. Google reserves all objections as to the admissibility at trial of any information or documents identified in its responses to these Interrogatories. By identifying any document or supplying any information, Google does not admit that such information or document is relevant to or admissible in this litigation. Google reserves the right to object to further inquiry with respect to any subject matter.

3. Google objects to the interrogatories, and to the definitions, to the extent that they purport to impose any obligations upon Google beyond the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

4. Google objects to the definition of “Defendant,” “Google,” “You,” or “Your” on the grounds that the definitions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they include: any Google parent, subsidiary, division, or related company; any business entity controlled by or operated on behalf thereof; any predecessors thereof; and any and all agents, directors, owners, officers, attorneys, employees, representatives, subcontracts, and/or any person acting on its behalf.

5. Google objects to the definition of “Accused Cast-Enabled App(s)” on the grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that it includes: any Google Cast-enabled app other than the YouTube Music app, Google Play Music app, YouTube app, Google Podcasts app, and YouTube TV app, and any third-party Cast-enabled app that allows a user to “cast” to an Accused Cast-Enabled Media Player (including but not limited to the Spotify app), and any Cast-enabled software (e.g., firmware and/or Cast-enabled apps) executable on an Accused Cast-Enabled Display that enables a user to “[m]ove media from one cast device to another,” either collectively or individually. Google will respond

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

with respect to the YouTube Music app, Google Play Music app, YouTube app, Google Podcasts app, and YouTube TV app.

6. Google objects to the definition of “Accused Google Product(s)” to the extent it includes Sonos’s definition of the term “Accused Cast-Enabled App(s).”

7. Google objects to the definition of “Accused Google Server[s]” on the grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that it purports to include: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] either collectively or individually. Google

will respond with respect to the servers specifically accused in Sonos’s infringement contentions.

8. Google objects to the instructions regarding “identify,” “describe,” or “identity” in the context of a person on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require inclusion of: the person’s present or last known home address, business and e-mail addresses, and respective phone numbers; present or last known place of employment and position; and his or her connection to the subject matter of the interrogatory.

9. Google objects to the instructions to “identify,” “describe,” or specify the “identity” in the context of a person who is a past or present director, officer, employee, agent, or representative of Google on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require specification of: all positions

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

or employments held by that person with Google, and the dates between which each such position or employment was held.

10. Google objects to the instructions to “identify,” “describe,” or specify the “identity” in the context of an entity on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require specification of: the entity’s place of incorporation or other business organization; its principal places of business; its present or last known mailing and physical address(es) and e-mail and website addresses; its present or last known phone number; the type of entity or organization, its date and place of formation and any place(s) in which it is registered to conduct business; its registered agent; and the identity of all individuals employed by or acting for it at any time who have knowledge of the matter with respect to which the entity is identified.

11. Google objects to the instructions to “identify,” “describe,” or specify the “identity” in the context of a document on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require specification of: the date it was authored, sent, and/or received; the identity of the author of the document; the identity of any recipient of the document; and the identity of the custodian of the document.

12. Google objects to the instructions to “identify,” “describe,” or specify the “identity” in the context of a communication on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require specification of: the date it was authored, sent, and/or received; the identity of the author of the document; the identity of any recipient of the document; and the identity of the custodian of the document. Google further objects to the instructions regarding “identify,” “describe,” or “identity” in the context of a communication to the extent that they suggest Google is required to search and

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

produce electronically stored information (ESI) before Sonos has shown good cause for ESI discovery, and the parties have agreed on a procedure for doing so in accordance with the Court’s Ordering Governing Proceedings for Patent Cases (OGP) 3.4.

13. Google objects to the instructions to “identify,” “describe,” or specify the “identity” in the context of a thing on the grounds that the instructions are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that they require specification of: its physical particulars; the day on which it was made; the identity of the persons who made it; the identity of the persons who asked that it be made; its present condition; and its present location.

14. Google objects to the instructions to “state all facts” on the grounds that the instructions are is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague, including but not limited to the extent that it requires specification of: the identification of any person or entity having knowledge of any such fact, including the last known address and phone number and the identity of any document, communication, or thing that refers, relates, or evidences any such fact.

15. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected from discovery.

16. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant to any claim or defense of any party or to the subject matter of this action, and is thus not proportional to the needs of the case.

17. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is compound and contains multiple subparts.

18. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague, and/or ambiguous.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

19. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that does not already exist or that is not in Google’s possession, custody, or control.

20. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it requires Google to provide information beyond what is available to Google at present from a reasonable search of its own files likely to contain relevant or responsive documents and from a reasonable inquiry of its present employees.

21. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks confidential or proprietary information, including without limitation, confidential business information, proprietary and/or competitively sensitive information, or trade secrets. Subject to its other General Objections, and to any specific objections set forth below, Google will only provide relevant information in a manner consistent with a Protective Order entered by the Court in this matter.

22. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is unlimited in time or otherwise not limited to a timeframe relevant to this litigation, and is therefore burdensome, oppressive, overly broad, and not proportional to the needs of the case.

23. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks a legal conclusion or expert testimony.

24. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is publicly available and therefore as accessible to Sonos as to Google.

25. Google objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is premature. Discovery is ongoing, and Google has not yet completed its investigation of the matters at issue in this action. Google reserves the right to modify, supplement, change or amend its responses after the Court has issued its claim construction order, and once Google has conducted the necessary discovery

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

and investigation.

26. Google’s responses are not to be construed as an admission that any of the requested information exists, that any information is admissible, relevant or proportional to the needs of the case, or that any contention or assumption contained in the interrogatories, whether implicit or explicit, is correct.

**OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO FACT DISCOVERY INTERROGATORIES**

**INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Describe in detail when and how Google first became aware of each Patent-In-Suit and the steps, if any, taken by Google as a result of such awareness, including, but not limited to: an explanation of the circumstances surrounding Google’s acquisition of such awareness; an identification of the person(s) who first became aware of each Patent-In-Suit and the source of such awareness (person, document, or otherwise); and an identification of the Google employees, officers, or directors that were aware of each Patent-In-Suit prior to the filing of the above-captioned litigation.

**OBJECTIONS:** Google incorporates by reference all of its General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Google objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, unclear as to information sought, and lacking sufficient particularity to permit Google to reasonably prepare a response with respect to the undefined terms “became aware,” “steps . . . taken by Google as a result of such awareness,” “circumstances,” “Google’s acquisition of such awareness,” “identification,” “first became aware,” and “source of such awareness.”

Google further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it assumes the existence of hypothetical facts that are incorrect or unknown to Google. Google also objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks communications and information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Google further objects to this

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks communications and information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks confidential and/or proprietary business information. Google also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is obtainable through less burdensome and more convenient forms of discovery. Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is unnecessarily cumulative or duplicative of information sought by other discovery, including Request for Production No. 25.

Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it purports to seek ESI before Sonos has shown good cause for such ESI and before the parties have agreed on a procedure for doing so in accordance with the Court’s OGP.

**RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific objections, Google responds, as follows:

Google objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case. Google is willing to meet and confer to clarify and narrow the scope of this request.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

If any Accused Instrumentality has been or will be designed, redesigned, altered, modified or changed in an effort to avoid infringement of any Asserted Claim, describe in detail the nature of that design, redesign, alteration, modification or change, explain in detail how such design, redesign, alteration, modification or change results in non-infringement of each Asserted Claim, including but not limited to identifying the specific claim limitation or limitations not practiced because of the change and state when the change was implemented in terms of both the date of the

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

change and the version of the Accused Instrumentality that includes the change, identify all documents concerning that design, redesign, alteration, modification or change, and identify the person or persons most knowledgeable about the design, redesign, alteration, modification or change.

**OBJECTIONS:** Google incorporates by reference all of its General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Google objects to the characterization of this interrogatory as a single interrogatory given that it contains multiple discrete subparts under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a)(1). Google objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, unclear as to information sought, and lacking sufficient particularity to permit Google to reasonably prepare a response with respect to the undefined terms “designed, redesigned, altered, modified or changed,” “implemented,” “version,” “design, redesign, alteration, modification or change,” and “most knowledgeable.” Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it assumes the existence of hypothetical facts that are incorrect or unknown to Google.

Google also objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case, including to the extent it seeks “*all* documents” concerning any “design, redesign, alteration, modification or change.” Google additionally objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks communications and information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks confidential and/or proprietary business information. Google also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is obtainable through less burdensome and more convenient forms of discovery. Google also objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it premature seeks expert discovery, opinion, and/or testimony.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

Google further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it purports to seek ESI before Sonos has shown good cause for such ESI and before the parties have agreed on a procedure for doing so in accordance with the Court’s OGP.

**RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific objections, Google responds, as follows:

Google objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

Describe in detail the complete legal and factual basis for each defense plead in Google’s Answer and Counterclaims (Dkt. 32), including but not limited to: an identification of all facts supporting or refuting Google’s defenses, all persons knowledgeable of these facts (including every person whose knowledge or opinion is or was relied upon as a basis for Google’s defenses, the opinion or substance of such person’s or persons’ knowledge, and the entire basis of that knowledge or opinion), and all documents and things, including the Bates number(s) of such documents and things, concerning Google’s defenses.

**OBJECTIONS:** Google incorporates by reference all of its General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Google objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, unclear as to information sought, and lacking sufficient particularity to permit Google to reasonably prepare a response with respect to the undefined terms “opinion” “is or was relied upon as a basis,” “opinion or substance,” and “entire basis.” Google further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it assumes the existence of hypothetical facts that are incorrect or unknown to Google.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

DATED: September 7, 2021

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP

By: /s/ Charles K. Verhoeven

Charles K. Verhoeven (*pro hac vice*)  
charlesverhoeven@quinnmanuel.com  
Melissa Baily (*pro hac vice*)  
melissabaily@quinnmanuel.com  
Jordan Jaffe (*pro hac vice*)  
jordanjaffe@quinnmanuel.com  
Lindsay Cooper (*pro hac vice*)  
lindsaycooper@quinnmanuel.com  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4788  
Telephone: (415) 875 6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875 6700

Paige Arnette Amstutz  
Texas State Bar No. 00796136  
SCOTT, DOUGLASS & McCONNICO, LLP  
303 Colorado Street, Suite 2400  
Austin, TX 78701  
Telephone: (512) 495-6300  
Facsimile: (512) 495-6399  
pamstutz@scottdoug.com

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via email on September 7, 2021.

*/s/ Jocelyn Ma*  
Jocelyn Ma